CC-IT: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REQUEST FY 2008-09

PROJECT COSTS AND APPROVAL SHEET

Project Title: Replace Child Care Automated Tracking System | Department: Human Services

Priority Number: | Purpose Code: F-4 | Risk Management I.D. No. N/A

Program: Child Care | State Controller Project No. Not Applicable

Project Contact: Leslie Bulicz | Contact Telephone: 303-866-4556 | e-mail: leslie.bulicz@state.co.us

IT Contact: Galina Krivoruk | Contact Telephone: 303-866-7305 | e-mail: galina.krivoruk@state.co.us

Dept. Approval by: _Reynold Jyh_ Date: 6 16 /08 | OSPB Approval: Date: 6 16 /08

	Total Project Costs	Prior Appropriation	Current Request	Year 2 Request	Year 3 Request	Year 4 Request	Year 5 Request
A. Land Acquisition							
(1) Land Purchase Cost							
B. Contract Professional Services							
(1) Consultants/Contractors	$ 11,547,651	$ 3,784,480	$ 7,763,171				
(2) Quality Assurance	$ -						
(3) Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V)	$ 230,560	$ 230,560	$ -				
(4) Training	$ -						
(5) Leased Space (temporary)	$ -						
(6) Feasibility Study	$ -						
(7) Other Services/Costs	$ -						
(8) Total Professional Services (1-7)	$ 11,778,211	$ 4,015,040	$ 7,763,171	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
C. Assoc. Building Construction							
(1) New (_____GSF)							
(2) Renovate (_____ GSF) Connection Costs							
(3) Site Work /Landscaping							
(4) Total Costs (Sum 1-3)							
D. Software Acquisition							
(1) Software COTS	$ 370,904	$ 33,096	$ 337,808				
(2) Software Built							
(3) Total Software Costs (1-2)	$ 370,904	$ 33,096	$ 337,808	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
E. Equipment							
(1) Servers	$ 71,173	$ 100,000	$ (28,827)				
(1a) Lan Maintenance							
(2) PCs, Laptops, Terminals, PDAs	$ 7,220	$ 37,782	$ (30,562)				
(3) Printers, Scanners, Peripherals							
(4) Network Equipment/Cabling							
(5) Other (specify)Telecomm							
(5b)POS Equipment	$ 1,818,000	$ 3,949,000	$ (2,131,000)				
(6) Total Equip. Cost	$ 1,896,393	$ 4,086,782	$ (2,190,389)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
F. Miscellaneous							
(1) Other (specify)							
TOTAL PROJECT COST	$ 14,045,508	$ 8,134,918	$ 5,910,590	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
G. Project Contingency Costs*							
(1) 5% for New	$ 702,275	$ 406,746	$ 295,529				
(2) 10% for Renovation							
(3) Total Contingency Requested	$ 702,275	$ 406,746	$ 295,529				
G. Total Budget Request [A(1)+B(8)+C(4)+D(3)+E(6)+F(1)+G(3)]	$ 14,747,783	$ 8,541,664	$ 6,206,119				
G. Source of Funds							
CCFE							
CF **							
CFE **							
FF **	$ 14,747,783	$ 8,541,664	$ 6,206,119				

*If a combination of 5% and 10%, reflect formula used. Must justify if over 10%.

** Must complete #7 in support information

1

CC-B: SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST
FY08 - 09

Department Name: HUMAN SERVICES

Division Name: CHILD CARE

Project Name: REPLACE CHILD CARE AUTOMATED TRACKING SYSTEM

Project Phase:
Risk Management I.D. No.

Executive Director Approval:
OSPB Approval:

Project Contact: Leslie Bulicz

Contact Telephone: 303-866-4556

Contact e-mail: Leslie.Bulicz@state.co.us

Submission Date:
State Controller Project No.

Date: 1 / 6 / 08
Date: 6 / 6 / 08

1. Criteria.
   (a) Check One
      ☑ Emergency
      ☑ New Data
      ☐ Technical
      ☐ Unforeseen Contingency

   (b) Describe the criteria:

In releasing the RFP to Replace Child Care Automated Tracking System, the State has received vendor bids that address the business requirements as defined by the State and multiple stakeholders, but as defined the costs exceed the spending authority previously requested and approved. Lessons learned with CBMS and other state systems, have identified that trying to make a project fit within finite funding has been unsuccessful to meet the identified needs, leading to false expectations in the user community, ongoing requests for additional funding and, in some cases, failed projects. This RFP was intentionally released without a specified budget to ensure that a true cost for the implementation of the system would be obtained from the vendor community.

The requirements that were identified in the RFP went though a number of review processes with the major stakeholders to ensure that they were accurate and complete. There were not any optional requirements included in the RFP. Trying to reduce the requirements will lead to a delivered system that will not provide the benefits upon which the project was approved. It is also recognized that the budget request was based on a feasibility study that is currently four years old, leading to a disconnect to the reality of the cost of producing the approved system.

2. Long Bill Appropriation Tables

Appropriation from Long Bill SB07-239 Capital Construction Budget, page 269					
Line Item(s)	**Total**	**CCFE**	**CF**	**RF**	**FF**
Replace Child Care Automated Tracking System	$8,541,664	$0	$0	$0	$8,541,664
Requested Revision of Long Bill Appropriation					
Line Item(s)	**Total**	**CCFE**	**CF**	**RF**	**FF**
Replace Child Care Automated Tracking System	$14,747,783	$0	$0	$0	$14,747,783*

* Two sources of Federal Funds:
  - $2,000,000 Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) Transfer to Child Care
  - $12,747,783 Child Care Development Funds (CCDF)

3. Justify the change from approved budget request and/or FPP:

  - Contract Professional Services costs are increased to $11,547,651, reflective of the vendor costs associated with a fully delivered system as requested through the RFP, and associated with Consultants/Contractors costs.
  - Software Acquisition costs are increased to $370,904, reflective of the vendor costs associated with a fully delivered system as requested through the RFP.
  - Equipment costs are decreased to $1,896,393, reflective of the vendor costs associated with a fully delivered system as requested through the RFP.
  - Contingency costs are increased to $702,275, reflective of the total increased costs of the project.

4. Why is it necessary to have the appropriation prior to the Long Bill?

It is necessary to have the appropriation prior to the Long Bill in order to avoid a one-year work delay. Additionally, the vendor bids are current at this time, but one year from now it can be assumed that the cost proposals for the work will reflect increased costs.

5. Does this request require revision of a prior appropriation? Yes. Explain.

The Department requests a revision to S.B. 07-239 Capital Construction Budget. This will allow the Department to enter into a contract with vendor to deliver an automated system that will meet the Department requirements as approved through S.B. 07-239.

6. Attach a copy of a complete Form CC-C of the *original* request.

Attached.

7. Attach a new completed Form CC-C (Element #1 only if there was a prior appropriation) to reflect this supplemental request.

   Attached.

8. Supplemental Requests Per S.B. 98-1331

   a) Describe the urgency of the request

   The urgency of the request relates to timeliness of vendor bids currently being assessed by the Department. The bids cannot be sectioned out to reduce costs without jeopardizing the functionality of the delivered system, which would result in the Department being unable to realize the benefits identified in the original request.

   b) List funds to be restricted: N/A

Long Bill No.	Appropriation	Expenditures	Amount to be restricted

ORIGINAL
REQUEST

Project Name: Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement   Phase 1 of 1
State Controller Project No. P- N/A
Page 2 of 22

CC-IT: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REQUEST

FY 2007-08 — SUPPORT INFORMATION

Project History and Description:

1.   Project Description/History:

The Department is requesting funding to develop an automated web based system to replace the current Child Care Automated Tracking System (CHATS). CHATS is the system of support for the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP). The current CHATS system was first developed in 1995 using ADABAS (database) and Natural (program language) on mainframe technology. This technology is difficult and expensive to maintain. While the business of DCC has evolved and grown more sophisticated in terms of supporting Colorado citizens, CHATS has not kept pace with these changes. This project will develop a web based Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement System. This will allow the Division to meet the technology needs of the Child Care Assistance Program for Colorado.

The Division of Child Care (DCC) and the Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) within the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) selected TeamExcel, a private consulting firm, through competitive bid to study the feasibility of replacing its current Childcare Automated Tracking System (CHATS). Feasibility studies are generally conducted to demonstrate due diligence regarding an examination of agency needs and soundness of direction should system replacement be recommended. The purpose of the feasibility study was to provide a recommendation for replacing the current system and to provide input to the system procurement process.

Requirements Summary

CHATS is a mission-critical data system that supports DCC and Colorado's 64 counties in managing over $90 million annually in subsidized child care (this includes Temporary Assistance to Needy Family (TANF) transfers) through the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program. The system serves over 40,000 children within 19,000 low income and disadvantaged families who receive services from 11,000 licensed and legally exempt (unlicensed) child care providers. CHATS currently supports many DCC business functions, including: client administration, provider administration, payments, recovery, program technical assistance, program monitoring, and reporting. It was first developed in 1995 using ADABAS and Natural on mainframe technology. This technology is difficult and expensive to maintain. While the business of DCC has evolved and grown more sophisticated in terms of supporting Colorado citizens, CHATS has not kept pace with these changes. CHATS was not considered for integration into CBMS due to fiscal restraints put on that project at the time of its development. In the ensuing time since implementation, assimilation into CBMS is considered too costly for the federal funding available, and is not looked at by the counties, who administer the program, as a viable option of meeting the needs of the program.
CHATS share approximately 20% of its clients with CBMS . These clients belong to TANF program. The other 80% of clients are unique to CHATS. There are existing interfaces between CBMS and CHATS to exchange data on common clients. These interfaces would be replicated in the new system.

The integration of CHATS into CBMS was evaluated during the System Assessment phase of the Feasibility Study.

During the System Assessment phase, six existing data systems (three out-of-state child care systems, Colorado Trails, CBMS and the current CHATS system) were evaluated based on the documented functional and non-functional requirements to objectively rank them in terms of their ability to address the specific automation needs of DCC. A total score was then calculated for each system and compared to the others. With the sole exception of CHATS, CBMS scored the lowest of the six systems assessed. The low score resulted in the conclusion that CBMS should not be considered for a more detailed cost benefit analysis.

Specific areas of weakness of the current CHATS that must be addressed are:
- Built on old technology and hard to maintain
- Not customer facing (does not allow for automated customer interaction)
- Does not support new e-Government initiatives
- Out of date with division business processes
- Little fraud and recovery support
- Very weak accounts receivable features
- Needs more payment flexibility

A more modern system is needed to:
- Meet business needs that have changed significantly since the current system was designed
- Significantly improve childcare attendance tracking, provider payments, and provider reconciliation and reporting resulting in reduced provider overpayments
- Afford better access to child care-related information by end users and customers.
- Significantly reduce the amount of fraud associated with administering subsidized child care programs
- Provide a vastly improved accounts receivable (A/R) capability to CHATS
- Create a web-based environment that addresses inefficiencies and maintenance costs of the current technological environment
- Meet the new goals of e-Government, including better and easier access to child care services by the general public

With the growing emergence of Internet technologies and availability of faster Internet interfaces, the opportunity now exists to develop an automated system for the child care assistance program in a web-based environment to address the above problems and meet the identified needs of all stakeholders and users of Colorado's subsidized child care programs.

It was imperative to define the business requirements during this feasibility study to make an informed decision regarding system replacement. Since automated systems should exist solely to meet business and customer needs, a straightforward approach was used to identify system features strictly on defined needs. First, the business functions of both state and county agencies were identified and examined for automation opportunities. Then those automation opportunities were documented and validated by over 30 system users and customers from across the state, with counties being the main stakeholder. Thus, only those requirements that could be directly traced to a business need remained on the list. The business validation of these system requirements became important when they were used to assess other systems that could be considered as CHATS replacements.

Alternative Analysis Summary

The feasibility study was conducted in three phases:
- Information Gathering
- System Assessment
- System Recommendations

Feasibility Study Report (FSR) guidelines from the Governor's Office of Innovation and Technology (OIT) were followed along with guidelines from the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB). OSPB's Efficiency and Effectiveness (E&E) cost-benefit analysis approach was used to compare alternatives and to recommend the best one.

Information Gathering Phase

The Information Gathering phase of this feasibility study first identified the business functions that an automated system for the child care assistance program must support. Then each business function at both the county and state level was examined to identify opportunities for automation. Each opportunity for automation resulted in one or more functional or non-functional requirements being identified. In the end, over 250 system requirements were identified by various stakeholder groups, including: state program, county program, state ITS, child care provider advocates, parent advocates, and state fraud experts. These requirements reflect current and future desired business practices and include references to modern technology as an enabler for business process improvements. (A copy of the FSR can be made available upon request.)

System Assessment Phase

During the System Assessment phase of the feasibility study, six existing data systems were compared to the aforementioned functional and non-functional requirements in order to rank them in terms of their ability to address the automation needs of DCC. Of the six systems that were reviewed three were web-based systems (Connecticut, Montana, and Wisconsin) and three systems were currently being used in the Department of Human Services (Colorado Trails, Client Benefits Management System, and CHATS). Colorado Trails is the automated Child Welfare Case Management system that includes tracking of Child Care providers. Client Benefits Management System (CBMS) is the eligibility system for Colorado Works, Food Stamps, and Medicaid. CHATS is the current child care automated system that provides payments to child care providers for the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program. A total score was then calculated for each system and compared to the others. Those scores resulted in the conclusion that three alternatives should be considered for a more detailed cost benefit analysis:
- Alternative 1: Build a web-based system with vendor support
- Alternative 2: Acquire and modify a system from another state with vendor support
- Alternative 3: Do nothing – do not replace CHATS

The current CHATS system has minimal accounts receivable capacity and this basic functionality is limited to client payments and not provider payments.. The system requires multiple entries to show a payment and is not able to accept payments other than cash or state tax intercept. The current childcare attendance tracking and payment reconciliation processes are highly manual. In addition, the current CHATS is not considered "customer facing" because it is not accessible by providers or parents; it is only visible to state and county staff.

Over 50% of the requirements identified in Information Gathering Phase are not available through the current CHATS system.

The objective of the new CHATS would be to meet the stated functionality of every requirement. Functions of the system that will include, but not limited to, improvements to accounts receivable capability, provider payments, reconciliation and reporting.

System Recommendations Phase

The System Recommendations phase for the FSR included a cost benefit analysis for all three alternatives, including the "do nothing" alternative, in order to identify the recommended solution. That cost/benefit analysis identified Alternative 1 as the preferred approach since it:

- Best met the business needs of DCC, and the counties in administration of the program, and provided the most compelling arguments to replace the current CHATS system
- Was the least expensive and cost approximately $8.0M, which includes $3.9M in hardware costs for one-time point-of-sale hardware purchases using card swipe technology
- Had the highest net benefit (benefits minus costs) when quantified benefits were considered

Proposed Alternative Summary

The preferred alternative identified by this FSR is to replace CHATS with a web-based system named Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement (ACCAPR). If the recommended option were funded in FY2008, it would result in a fully operational replacement for CHATS in a web-based environment at the start of FY2010 (July 2009). Implementation of Alternative 1 would address all the needs identified in the Requirements Summary section above.

Project Management Plan Summary

Alternative 1 recommends the state hire an experienced and qualified development vendor to assist OITS in creating the ACCAPR system. CDHS, DCC and OITS will jointly manage and be responsible for the success of this project. A high-level project timeline with tasks, estimated durations, and approximate start and end dates has been developed for the implementation of ACCAPR. The project will be undertaken in two major phases:

- FY2008 and FY2009 – System Development
- FY2010 and beyond – Maintenance Mode

The FSR also recommends that DCC employ several key strategies when implementing Alternative 1 to ensure the success of replacing the current CHATS system. These strategies include:

- Detailed requirements: Develop detailed system requirements prior to development vendor selection to allow for more development time prior to the target June 30, 2009 cutover date
- Select development vendor: Develop a request for proposals (RFP) and issue a competitive bid to select a development vendor
- Independent assessment: Ensure appropriate use of an Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) vendor as the development effort is undertaken
- Involve and train OITS staff: Involve CHATS programming staff and key OITS technical staff during the development period and provide appropriate training to staff who will support the infrastructure in the future
- Technical coordination: Maximize dialog and coordination between the development and IV&V vendors, DCC, OITS, and OIT

- Colorado Trails core functionality: Examine the potential for using some Colorado Trails functionality, specifically its provider resource and fiscal modules, within an automated system for the child care assistance program to maximize code re-use, where appropriate
- Resource sharing: Maximize the sharing of Department resources per the Governor's New Century Colorado program

  (a) List key objectives of proposed project:

  Key Objects for this proposed project are:
    - Meet business needs that have changed significantly since the current system was designed
    - Significantly improve childcare attendance tracking, provider payments, and provider reconciliation and reporting resulting in reduced provider overpayments
    - Afford better access to child care-related information by end users and customers.
    - Significantly reduce the amount of fraud associated with administering subsidized child care programs
    - Provide a vastly improved accounts receivable (A/R) capability to CHATS
    - Create a web-based environment that addresses inefficiencies and maintenance costs of the current technological environment
    - Meet the new goals of e-Government, including better and easier access to child care services by the general public

2. Estimated Project Timetable. *(**Each Phase Must Accomplish Distinct, Stand-Alone Functions**)*

Timetable			
Phase	Start Date(s)	Completion Date(s)	Remarks
RFP/Contract Negotiation	7/2/2007	12/31/2007	Issue development vendor RFP - Put Development Vendor Contract in Place
Development and Implementation	1/1/2008	3/24/2009	Implement Detailed Design - End of Development
IV & V	1/1/2008	3/24/2009	Develop IV&V Plan – End of Development
System Testing	3/24/2009	6/17/2009	End of Testing period
Roll Out - List Phases	6/17/2009	6/30/2009	Perform Product Rollout/System Cutover

  (a) Phasing Justification.

  This project is proposed as a single phase; splitting the project into multiple phases would hamper its implementation.

  The Department will utilize the Child Care Development Funds 100% Discretionary Federal Funds to develop and implement Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement System. This funding will allow for development and implementation to be followed with the testing phase and the roll out of the system to the 64 county departments.

(b) (***Only For Continuation Projects***) Expenditure Information.
Year-to-Date Expenditure: $__N/A_____ as of __/__/____

Update of phase progression and expenditures:

Justification Section:

3.   Project/Program Justification –

(a) Justification Related to Programs and Classifications served by Request (describe and
enumerate):

Justification Table						
Program Service Population	**Actual FY 03-04**	**Actual FY 04-05**	**Estimate FY 05-06**	**Projected FY 06-07**	**Projected FY 07-08**	**Projected FY 08-09**
Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP) Eligible Clients	45,025	42,795	40,500	41,512	42,550	43,614

With the growing emergence of Internet technologies and availability of faster Internet
interfaces, the opportunity now exists to develop an automated system for the child care
assistance program in a web-based environment to address the above problems and meet the
identified needs of all stakeholders and users of Colorado's subsidized child care programs.

The federal government is in the process of imposing an error rate onto Child Care for the
first time. They are currently in the study phase of what is a reasonable rate through a multi-
year process of determining current state-level improper payments. Colorado was found to
have a high number of errors, resulting in an error rate of 8%. It was found that the current
system, CHATS, did not support the capacity to reduce errors through technology. The
proposed alternative has this capacity as defined in business requirements.

CCCAP client numbers have decreased in recent years due to counties using less TANF
transfer dollars to serve this population. The counties receive a set allocation, but may
supplement that amount with county-specific TANF transfers, at their discretion. Due to the
uncertainty that was created over the past three years when TANF reauthorization was not
going forward at the federal level, counties felt the need to keep TANF reserves available in
case there was increased participation required in Colorado Works without increased federal
funding. When TANF finally was reauthorized in February 2006, in deed that was the case,
so those reserves may not become available for CCCAP general use by counties in the
foreseeable future. The increases in eligible clients reflected in FY 06-07 through FY 08-09
reflect the increased participation rate and numbers of work hours required under TANF
reauthorization as of FFY 2006.

Quantified Benefits of Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement System
•   Improved fiscal accountability via enhanced payment features, including less
overpayments to parents and child care providers and reduced staff efforts required to
make adjustments to payments

- Reduced fraud and increased recoveries due to more accurate record keeping and more extensive data validation edits
- Improved payment reconciliation and reporting to providers and parents
- Improved quality of program monitoring at the state level
- Reduced effort in reconciling duplicate family records when they move from one county to another
- Lower application hardware, software, and maintenance support costs
- Reduced programming efforts for implementing change requests due to improved design and architecture, improved programming language, and centralized code base
- Economies of scale based on co-development with other like initiatives (i.e. web-based) in the state
-

Un-quantified Benefits of Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement System
- Increased number of families served due to cost avoidance
- Increased percentage of correct people being served while reducing the number of people who should not be served
- Improved quality of service for parents, child care providers, DCC staff, county staff, advocate agencies, research agencies, general public, etc.
- Elimination of many labor-intensive manual and paper-based processes
- Alignment with federal improper payment (fraud and recovery) initiatives
- Real-time access to state-wide CHATS data as opposed to access only after month-end data has been reconciled
- Improved business processes due to process re-engineering as a natural outcome of system design and implementation
  Improved integration between service delivery partners and other systems in the future by being more industry compliant (e.g. web-based, Java-based, state portal-based, etc.)

(b) Purpose Code Justification: F4 – New Projects Current Program Needs – Solutions to Existing Deficiencies (F), Technology Infrastructure Improvements (4)

(c) Project Alternatives (include impact of not funding requested project):

Alternative 1: Build a web-based system in-house with contract resource vendor support - The cost benefit analysis determined that a web-based system with vendor support should be built. DCC can build a web-based system using a combination of in-house and contract resources to handle their child care requirements. In this alternative the Department can maximize existing mature code using a portion of Colorado Trails existing functionality to meet user requirements. All current and future functionality would be considered collectively to ensure overall efficiency and effectiveness of the system. This alternative is recommended.

Alternative 2: Acquire and modify a system from another state with vendor support. Several states have current Child Care systems that could be purchased and customized to meet the Department's needs. The county-administered system of services provided that is used by Colorado demands a high level of customization. The feasibility study assessed six potential replacement systems including the current CHATS system. The current system does not have the potential to map its functionality

precisely to Colorado's needs. The six potential systems that were assessed had scores that range from 3397 (existing CHATS) to a high of 7762 (Connecticut web-based system) of 11430 maximum score.   The cost benefit analysis demonstrated that this alternative is not recommended.

Alternative 3: Take no Action and the CHATS system would not be replaced. The CHATS architecture is based on old technology and is relatively difficult to maintain. The system is becoming increasingly out of date with the division's desired business processes and will require significant modification in order to incorporate enhanced functionality (e.g. time and attendance tracking, improved fraud and recovery support, increased payment flexibility etc.) This alternative is not recommended.

Project Relationship Section:

4. Project Association to Other Capital Improvement Projects:

N/A – This project is not associated with other Capital Improvement Projects.

5. (*Only For Continuation Requests*) Comparison with Prior Request Made in FY __ - __

Inflation Assumption					
Total Cost of Original Approved Request	**New Total Cost Requested**	**Difference**	**Inflation Factor Used**	**Dollar Impact of Inflation Factor on Original Request**	**Difference *not* due to Inflation**

(a) Explanation of Differences. (*Deviation from OSPB-specified inflation factor must be pre-approved*):
Not Applicable.

Operating Impact:

6. Project Operating Impact:

Operating Balance Sheet					
Project Operating Cost	**First Year Operating Cost** (*Change Request Amount*)	**Second Year Operating Cost**	**Third Year Operating Cost**	**Fourth Year Operating Cost**	**Fifth Year Operating Cost**
Contractors					
Maintenance		33,333	1,239,291	1,263,469	1,287,949
Telecommunications	9,151	7,851			
Supplies/Equipment					
Training	32,000				
Other	32,773	6,500			
Total Estimated Operating Cost	73,924	47,685	1,239,291	1,263,469	1,287,949
Total Fund					
General Fund			619,645	631,734	643,974
Cash Fund*					
Cash Fund Exempt*					
Federal Funds- Fund 100 Child Care Development Funds	73,924	47,685	619,646	631,735	643,975

(a) Operating Cost Assumptions:

- Telecommunication installation and monthly for costs for contract staff during the development and implementation phase. (Phone 13 contractors x $100.00 per phone=$1,300.00 + $603.96 x13= $7851(line) for two years
- Assumes $2000 per training class, needed for 2 existing CHATS OITS team members x 5 skill sets
- Assumes $2000 per training class, needed for 2 existing OITS tech staff x 3 skill sets
- Materials and supplies for the project based on OSPB common policies
- Maintenance of 2 web servers, 2 application servers, 2 DB servers, 1 demo server, 1 repository server, 1 test server, 1 back-up server. Based on common polices
- Maintenance of Point-of-Service equipment allowing for a 2% provider caseload growth. – Assumes $4.00 per case per month, including cost of card stock out. #Cases 25000x$4.00x12mth
-

A complete list of cost assumptions can be made available upon request.

(b) The OSPB operating budget analyst ____<u>Kate Macleod</u>_____ has received a copy of the schedule 6 to cover the operating expenses denominated the above table.

Project Funding

7. (*Required For Cash Funded, Partial Cash Funded, or Lease-Purchase Projects*) Capital
   Finance Sources: Not Applicable - Child Care Development Fund – Federal Funds are
   proposed for this project.

Financing Balance Sheet							
Revenue Sources Fund Lists (List Each)	**Fund No.**	**Actual FY 03-04**	**Actual FY 04-05**	**Current Fund Balance**	**Projected FY 06-07**	**Projected FY 07-08**	**Projected FY 08-09**
Cash Fund							
Cash Fund Exempt							
Federal Funds	100						
Capital Construction Funds Exempt							
Total Funding			N/A				

   (a) For each cash funded source describe how the revenues accrue to the fund.
   (b) Demonstrate that sufficient funding is available from this source.
   (c) Finance Information – N/A
       Amount Financed $_____
       Duration of Agreement   _____
       Interest Rate   ____%
       Revenue Source   _____

Associated Building Construction (*Only For Building Construction, Renovations and Additions Associated with IT Project*)

8. Controlled Maintenance and Capital Construction Record. Not Applicable
    (a) Estimated Current Value $_____
    (c) Past 5 year Building Record Table

Past 5 Year Capital Construction Projects			
Year	**Project #**	**Item**	**Cost**
FY2005-06			
FY2004-05			
FY2003-04			
FY1902-03			
FY1901-02			
Past 5 Year Controlled Maintenance Projects			
FY2005-06			
FY2004-05			
FY2003-04			
FY1902-03			
FY1901-02			

9. Space Requirements for Additions or Renovations Associated with IT project. – Not
    Applicable

Type of Space (List)	Existing ASF	ASF Needed Under Master Plan or Recommended Industry Standard (describe)	Surplus /(Deficit) ASF	Impact of This Project	Revised Surplus /(Deficit)	% Surplus /Deficit	Project GSF
TOTAL							

Project Compliance:

10. **REQUIRED Indicate Appropriate Approval Authority** (*Requests cannot be forwarded
    for consideration unless following questions are completed*)

    a) This Project Request (is) in conformance with the most recently approved **Feasibility
        Study** for this project entitled <u>Childcare Automated Tracking System Feasibility
        Study and approved on 12/31/2004 by Ron Ozga</u>. (if <u>not available</u>, explain why
        below.)

    b) This Project Request (is) in conformance with the most recently approved **IMC
        Approved Department Information Technology Plan** for this project entitled
        _Automated Child Care Assistance Program Replacement System and approved on
        __/__/___ by __(if <u>not available</u>, explain why below.)

        This project is being submitted in this year's Department Information Technology
        Plan for the next request year, FY07-08.

    c) This Project Request (is) in conformance with the most recently approved
        Departmental Operating Strategic Plan for this project entitled _Automated Child
        Care Assistance Program Replacement System and approved on __/__/___ by __
        below.) (If <u>not available</u>, explain why below.)

        This project is being submitted in this year's Department Operating Strategic Plan for
        the next request year, FY07-08.

11. Six Month Rule Compliance.

    (a) Amount and percentage encumbered: Approximately $3,500,000 or about 40% of the
    project total will be encumbered within 6 months of the establishment of spending authority
    for the project.

    (b) Justification: The Department will enter into a contract for the Development Vendor for
    the system.

CC-IT: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION <u>TECHNOLOGY</u> PROJECT REQUEST FY 2008-09

PROJECT COSTS AND APPROVAL SHEET

Project Title:Automated Child Care Assistance Program System Replacement			Department: Human Services				
Priority Number: 3 of 5			Purpose Code F-4		Risk Management I.D. No.__ N/A		
Program: Child Care			State Controller Project No. Not Applicable				
Project Contact: Leslie Bulicz			Contact Telephone: 303-866-4556		e-mail: leslie.bulicz@state.co.us		
IT Contact: Galina Krivoruk			Contact Telephone: 303-866-7305		e-mail: galina.krivoruk@state.co.us		
Dept. Approval by:		Date:__/__/___	OSPB Approval:_____		Date:__/__/___		

	Total Project Costs	Prior Appropriation	Current Request	Year 2 Request	Year 3 Request	Year 4 Request	Year 5 Request
A. Land Acquisition							
(1) Land Purchase Cost							
B. Contract Professional Services							
(1) Consultants/Contractors	$ 3,784,480		$ 3,784,480				
(2) Quality Assurance	$ -						
(3) Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V)	$ 230,560		$ 230,560				
(4) Training	$ -						
(5) Leased Space (temporary)	$ -						
(6) Feasibility Study	$ -						
(7) Other Services/Costs	$ -						
(8) Total Professional Services (1-7)	$ 4,015,040		$ 4,015,040	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
C. Assoc. Building Construction							
(1) New (_____GSF)							
(2) Renovate (_____ GSF) Connection Costs							
(3) Site Work /Landscaping							
(4) Total Costs (Sum 1-3)							
D. Software Acquisition							
(1) Software COTS	$ 33,096		$ 33,096				
(2) Software Built							
(3)Total Software Costs (1-2)	$ 33,096		$ 33,096	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
E. Equipment							
(1) Servers	$ 100,000		$ 100,000				
(1a) Lan Maintenance							
(2) PCs, Laptops, Terminals, PDAs	$ 37,782		$ 37,782				
(3) Printers, Scanners, Peripherals							
(4) Network Equipment/Cabling							
(5) Other (specify)Telecomm							
(5b)POS Equipment	$ 3,949,000		$ 3,949,000				
(6) Total Equip. Cost	$ 4,086,782		$ 4,086,782	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
F. Miscellaneous							
(1) Other (specify)							
TOTAL PROJECT COST	$ 8,134,918		$ 8,134,918	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
G. Project Contingency Costs*							
(1) 5% for New	$ 406,746		$ 406,746				
(2) 10% for Renovation							
(3) Total Contingency Requested	$ 406,746		$ 406,746				
G. Total Budget Request **[A(1)+B(8)+C(4)+D(3)+E(6)+F(1)+G(3)]**	$ 8,541,664		$ 8,541,664				
G. Source of Funds							
CCFE							
CF **							
CFE **							
FF **	$ 8,541,664		$ 8,541,664				

*If a combination of 5% and 10%, reflect formula used. Must justify if over 10%.

** Must complete #7 in support information